

REMARKS

The office action of September 14, 2005 (the Office Action) has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 12-15, 18-30, 33-36, 39, 40 and 43-49 are pending in this application. Claims 12, 23, 25, 26, 39, and 43-49 are amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification as originally filed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-15, 23, 25, 26, 39, and 40

Claims 12-15, 23, 25, 26, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,635 to Burakoff et al. (Burakoff) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,980 to Reese (Reese). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 12, 23, 25, 26, 27, and 39 have been amended to more clearly recite the embodiments of the invention set forth therein. It is respectfully submitted that neither of Burakoff and Reese, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the aspects of the invention recited in the claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Burakoff teaches “normalizing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol formatted according to a predetermined structure.” Office Action at p. 2. Applicants note that in the previous Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged that Burakoff *does not* teach “normalizing the input symbol formatted according to a predetermined structure,” and instead relied on Reese to remedy this deficiency of Burakoff. See Office Action dated September 14, 2005 at p. 2. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Burakoff nor Reese teaches “normalizing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol *in a standardized form* according to a predetermined structure,” as recited in the claims as amended herein.

Burakoff merely teaches identifying and extracting the desired information from a document database or storing desired information on a file server. In another aspect of Burakoff, Burakoff teaches marking the lines of text in a document added to a document database with a unique number. Burakoff, col. 3, lines 52-67. None of these aspects of Burakoff is in any way

similar to normalizing an input symbol to provide an input symbol in a standardized form according to a predetermined structure.

Moreover, Reese also does not teach or suggest normalizing an input symbol to provide an input symbol in a standardized form according to a predetermined structure. The Examiner asserts that it is unclear from the claim language, specification, and drawings what is meant by normalizing and a normalized symbol, and that therefore it is interpreted that Reese teaches normalizing. Office Action at p. 15. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to the claims clarify what is meant by normalizing and a normalized symbol, and that Reese does not disclose or suggest in any way normalizing or a normalized symbol as recited in the claims. Reese merely teaches that “***the user selects a security*** by use of a security selection means (FIG. 14, box 338) . . . Through the utilization of criteria ***based upon the selection of the user*** the select query is able to retrieve ***just the recommendations for the security chosen.***” Reese, col. 14, lines 8-9 and 23-26 (emphasis added). There is no teaching or suggestion at all in Reese to perform the step of normalizing the user’s input as recited in claims

Withdrawal of rejection of claims 12, 23, 25, 26, 27, and 39 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 13-15 and 40 are allowable over the combination of Burakoff and Reese for the reasons set forth above and in view of the additional inventive steps recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13-15 and 40 is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-22 and 24

The Examiner rejects claims 18-22 and 24 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,635 to Burakoff et al. (Burakoff) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,980 to Reese (Reese) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,940,843 Zucknovich (Zucknovich). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 18-22 and 24 depend from claim 12. As set forth above, neither Burakoff nor Reese, standing alone or in combination, discloses the embodiment recited in claim 12 as amended herein. Specifically, neither Burakoff nor Reese, standing alone or in combination, discloses or suggests “normalizing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol ***in a***

Attorney Docket No. 003433.00081
U.S. Serial No. 09/336,031
Response to Office Action dated May 26, 2006

standardized form according to a predetermined structure,” as recited in amended claim 12 from which claims 18-22 and 24 depend. Moreover, Zucknovich does not remedy this deficiency of Burakoff and Reese, and the Examiner does not cite Zucknovich for this purpose. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Burakoff with Reese and Zucknovich does not disclose or suggest the embodiments recited in claims 18-22 and 24, and these claims are therefore patentable in view of the patentability of base claim 12 and further in view of the additional inventive steps recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 27-29

The Examiner rejects claims 27-29 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,635 to Burakoff et al. (Burakoff) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,980 to Reese (Reese). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 27-29 depend from claim 25. As set forth above, neither Burakoff nor Reese, standing alone or in combination, discloses the embodiment recited in claim 25 as amended herein. Specifically, neither Burakoff nor Reese, standing alone or in combination, discloses or suggests “normalizing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol ***in a standardized form*** according to a predetermined structure,” as recited in amended claim 25 from which claims 27-29 depend. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Burakoff with Reese does not disclose or suggest the embodiments recited in claims 27-29, and these claims are therefore patentable in view of the patentability of base claim 25 and further in view of the additional inventive steps recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 30 and 33-36

The Examiner rejects claims 30 and 33-36 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,635 to Burakoff et al. (Burakoff) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,980 to Reese (Reese) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,940,843 Zucknovich (Zucknovich). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 30 and 33-36 depend from claim 25. As set forth above, neither Burakoff nor

Reese, standing alone or in combination, discloses the embodiment recited in claim 25 as amended herein. Specifically, neither Burakoff nor Reese, standing alone or in combination, discloses or suggests “normalizing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol *in a standardized form* according to a predetermined structure,” as recited in amended claim 25 from which claims 30 and 33-36 depend. Moreover, Zucknovich does not remedy this deficiency of Burakoff and Reese, and the Examiner does not cite Zucknovich for this purpose. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Burakoff with Reese and Zucknovich does not disclose or suggest the embodiments recited in claims 18-22 and 24, and these claims are therefore patentable in view of the patentability of base claim 12 and further in view of the additional inventive steps recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 43-49

The Examiner rejects each of claims 43-49 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,635 to Burakoff et al. (Burakoff) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,980 to Reese (Reese). The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

As set forth above, neither Burakoff nor Reese, standing alone or in combination, discloses the embodiment recited in claims 43-49 as amended herein. Specifically, neither Burakoff nor Reese, standing alone or in combination, discloses or suggests “normalizing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol *in a standardized form* according to a predetermined structure,” as recited in the claims.

Claim 43

The Examiner correctly acknowledges the Burakoff does not teach “normalizing the input symbol, based on a historical pattern of a contributor of the information element, to generate a normalized symbol,” and relies on Reese to remedy this deficiency. Office Action at p. 12. It is respectfully submitted that Reese does not disclose “normalizing the input symbol, based on a historical pattern of a contributor of the information element, to generate a normalized symbol, *said normalized symbol being in a standard form according to a predetermined structure*” as recited in amended claim 43. As discussed above, Reese merely uses the user’s

security selection to search for information regarding the security identified by the user's selection. Reese, col. 14, lines 8-9 and 23-26. The only securities that are searched and displayed are those that are actually selected, i.e., identified as input, by the user. There is no suggestion whatsoever of normalizing the user's input to obtain a standardized input that is formatted according to a predetermined structure, as recited in claim 43 as amended. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 43 is respectfully requested.

Claim 44

The Examiner correctly acknowledges the Burakoff does not teach "normalizing the input symbol, based on a preference of a contributor of the information element, to generate a normalized symbol," and relies on Reese to remedy this deficiency. Office Action at p. 12. It is respectfully submitted that neither Burakoff nor Reese, alone or in combination, discloses "normalizing the input symbol, based on a historical pattern of a contributor of the information element, to generate a normalized symbol, *said normalized symbol being in a standard form according to a predetermined structure*" as recited in amended claim 44. As discussed above, Reese merely uses the user's security selection to search for information regarding the security identified by the user's selection. Reese, col. 14, lines 8-9 and 23-26. The only securities that are searched and displayed are those that are actually selected, i.e., identified as input, by the user. There is no suggestion whatsoever of normalizing the user's input to obtain a standardized input that is formatted according to a predetermined structure, as recited in claim 44 as amended. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 44 is respectfully requested.

Claim 45

The Examiner rejects claim 45 for the same reason as set forth with respect to claim 43. Consequently, the arguments regarding patentability of claim 43 apply with equal force to claim 45, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 45 is respectfully requested.

Claim 46

The Examiner rejects claim 46 for the same reasons as set forth with respect to claims 43 and 45. Consequently, the arguments regarding patentability of claim 43 apply with equal force to claim 46, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 46 is respectfully requested.

Claim 47

The Examiner rejects claim 47 for the same reason as set forth with respect to claim 45. The Examiner further acknowledges that Burakoff does not teach “normalizing the input symbol, based on an identification of a submitter of an input symbol, to generate a normalized symbol,” and relies on Reese to remedy this deficiency. It is respectfully submitted that neither Burakoff nor Reese, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests “normalizing the input symbol, based on an identification of a submitter of an input symbol, to generate a normalized symbol, *said normalized symbol being in a standard form according to a predetermined structure*” as recited in claim 47 as amended herein, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 43. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 47 is respectfully requested.

Claim 48

The Examiner rejects claim 48 for the same reasons as set forth with respect to claims 45 and 47. Consequently, the arguments regarding patentability of claim 45 and 47 apply with equal force to claim 48, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 48 is respectfully requested.

Claim 49

The Examiner rejects claim 49 for the same reasons as set forth with respect to claims 47 and 48. Consequently, the arguments regarding patentability of claims 47 and 48 apply with equal force to claim 49, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 49 is respectfully requested.

Attorney Docket No. 003433.00081
U.S. Serial No. 09/336,031
Response to Office Action dated May 26, 2006

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, all rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: August 28, 2006

By: /Anthony W. Kandare/

Anthony W. Kandare,
Registration No. 48,830

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001